



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,385	02/27/2002	Satoshi Hirahara	220049US0	4760
22850	7590	11/26/2004		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER	VO, HAI
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/083,385	HIRAHARA ET AL. JTA
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Hai Vo	1771	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11,13-15,30,32,34 and 36-41.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the 112 claim rejections, first paragraph. Support for "the point contact is a particle of a thermosetting resin" is found in the paragraph bridging pages 29 and 30 and example 8 of the present specification.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the following reasons. Applicants argue that the "point contact" of the present claims is not the same as the prior art generic "point contact". The process of present invention provides a sheet where the binder is discontinuous over the fiber surfaces and is present as cured particles at certain points on the fibers where the fiber sections meet. On the other hand, the process of prior art provides a sheet where the binder is present both over the fiber surfaces and at certain points on the fibers where the fiber sections meet. The examiner disagrees. In the first place, the language of the claims does not exclude an embodiment where the binder is present over the fiber surfaces. Secondly, the paragraph bridging pages 29 and 30 recites that the binder does cover the surface of the fibers in addition to bonding the fibers to one another through "point contact". Further, the process at pages 27 and 28 of the present specification does not positively disclose the surface of fiber being not covered by the binder. It is believed that the surface of fiber would be inherently covered by the binder through spraying as well as through dipping. Nothing in the claims is specific that the binder is completely absent on the fiber surfaces. Therefore, the presently claimed subject matter does not exclude Miwa as modified by Koshany. The art rejections are thus sustained.

Claim 41 should be included in the art rejections over Miwa in view of Koshany in the 09/08/2004 Office Action. Miwa discloses the binder being a mixture of resol type phenolic resin and novolak type phenolic resin (column 10, lines 30-35). It is known in the art that the novolak type phenolic resin is present in the form of particles. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the point contact is a particle of a thermoplastic resin after curing.

Hai Vo  
Tech Center 170